the Trust Boards. No doubt, the Municipal Council took up an attitude like that. I wonder whether the attitude was quite correct. It is quite likely that the Council had a different point of view to look at it. But, it does not mean by any means that because the Municipal Council felt that the Trust Board.....

**Sri L. SIDDAPPA.**—But it was an unanimous resolution of the Municipal Council.

**The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.**—May be unanimous. That is not the point. The point is, the question of abolition of the Trust Board is a totally different issue. Here, we are trying to improve upon what provisions exist for the improvement of the city. So, let there be no confusion between the two issues. It is open for any Hon'ble Member here to bring in a motion to abolish the Trust Board. I cannot prevent any member of the House from bringing in any such motion. But, whether that motion will commend itself to the House is a totally different matter. Well, all that I can say is this. There is a great responsibility on this Government or on any Government to see that every phase of activity in the State is helped, is fostered, is nurtured and nourished well. I may have the permission of my Hon'ble colleagues to say that predominantly this Government has something like a rural bias; the Congress still has got a rural bias. But, it does not mean that these cities should be allowed to be neglected or the progress of the cities should be of no concern to them. It would be a sorry day if we ever take up an attitude like that. Therefore, we have here provided a necessary measure of legislation, just and no more than what is necessary, for the purpose of efficient working of the Trust Board. I commend this motion for the acceptance of the House.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The question is:

"That the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The House will now adjourn for lunch.

---

*The House adjourned for Lunch at Fifty Minutes past Two of the Clock and reassembled at Twenty Minutes past Three of the Clock, Mr. Speaker (The Hon'ble Sri V. Venkatappa) in the Chair.*

---

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Clauses 2 to 31, both inclusive. The question is:

"That Clauses 2 to 31, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

Clauses 2 to 31, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Clause 1. The question is:

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Title and Preamble. The question is:

"That the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

*Motion to pass.*

**The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.**—Sir, I move:

"That the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be passed."

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—The question is:

"That the City of Mysore Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

---

## Statement *re*: General Elections in Mysore.

**The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA** (Minister for Finance and Industries):—The Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to say that the Hon'ble Sri K. T. Bhashyam may make a statement about the arrangement for the General Elections, about the constituencies and so on. If the Hon'ble Speaker allows it, the Hon'ble Minister is ready to make the statement. It is left to the Hon'ble Speaker.

The Hon'ble Sri K. T. BHASHYAM (Minister for Law and Labour).—I leave it to the Hon'ble Speaker to permit me to make the statement now or on the 13th morning at 12 of the Clock as you decide. For my part, however, I am quite prepared.

Mr. SPEAKER. (The Hon'ble Sri V. Venkatappa)—I have no objection. But many Hon'ble Members are not here now. I think it is better we take it up after question-hour on the 13th.

Mushir-ul-Mulk J. MOHAMED IMAM (Chitaldrug *cum* Tumkur –Muslim): I would like to know whether the meeting is to be held in the morning on the 13th because that day happens to be Saturday.

The Hon'ble Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—I have no objection for a morning session that day if it suits the convenience of the Hon'ble Members.

---

## The Mysore Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill, 1951.

*Motion to consider.*

The Hon'ble Sri K. T. BHASHYAM (Minister for Law and Labour).—Sir, I move :

"That the Mysore Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill, 1951, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

In making this motion, I wish to bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Members that the changes made by the Select Committee are very few. They have said that clause 3 of the original Bill may be deleted. That referred to the conditions under which second appeals could be preferred to the High Court. You will find, Sir, from the original Bill which was placed before the Select Committee, that that section reads as follows :—

"To Section 15 of the said Act, the following proviso shall be added, namely :—

"Provided that notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force, except by special leave of the High Court, no second appeal shall lie—

(i) in a suit for money or in a suit on a simple mortgage when the amount or value of the subject matter of the suit does not exceed Rs. 2,000;

(ii) in a suit for possession of a house or garden land, or unassessed land or any interest therein when the market value of the subject matter on the date of presenting the plaint does not exceed Rs. 1,000;

(iii) in a suit for possession of land or any interest therein other than those specified in clause (ii) when the total annual assessment does not exceed Rs. 8;

These are the conditions imposed relating to second appeals to the High Court. It so happens that section 100 of the Civil Procedure Code refers also to the conditions under which second appeals could lie to the High Court. So the Select Committee felt that in view of the fact that the Civil Procedure Code of the Central Government has now been introduced into Mysore since 1st October 1951, we could as well have section 100 of the Civil Procedure Code amended and we need not go into it in this Bill. I think that is a very wholesome suggestion. Therefore we agreed that clause 3 may be omitted.

The rest of the clauses remain as they are and the main point in those two clauses is that the jurisdictions for appeal to the High Court and to the District Court are definitely stated. Under Section 13 of the Civil Courts Act, all appeals against decisions involving more than Rs. 3,000 used to go to the High Court and all appeals against decisions involving Rs. 3,000 and less used to go to the District Court. Now the amendment is that all decisions involving Rs. 10,000 and less shall go to the District Court instead of to the High Court. The jurisdiction of the Sub-Judge has been raised to Rs. 10,000. So from the Sub-Judge's decision the appeal will be direct to the District Judge and not to the High Court. That is one portion of the Report on the Bill.

The other portion refers to the number of holidays of the Civil Courts. Under Section 22 of the Civil Courts Act, the High Court had the power to grant holidays not exceeding six weeks in a year. It was felt that in common with all other High Courts and all other Subordinate Courts in the rest of India, the period should be extended to sixty days instead of forty-two days and that is why section 22 is proposed to be amended as follows :